



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,053	10/22/2003	Chris Wimmer	MSI-1743US	6082
22801	7590	04/21/2008	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			GEE, JASON KAI YIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/21/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/691,053

**Applicant(s)**

WIMMER, CHRIS

**Examiner**

JASON K. GEE

**Art Unit**

2134

**Period for Reply** -- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-9, 11-13, 15-29, 31-32, and 34-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-9, 11-13, 15-29, 31-32, and 34-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is response to communication: RCE filed on 01/25/2008.
2. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-13, 15-29, 31-32, and 34-35 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 19, and 31 are independent claims.
3. No IDS was received for this application.
4. Receipt is acknowledged of a request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) and a submission, filed 01/25/2008.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Objections***

6. The previous claim objections have been withdrawn in response to applicant's amendments.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

7. The previous 101 rejections have been withdrawn in response to applicant's amendments.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 13, 15-29, 31-32, and 34-35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per all the pending claims, the independent claims recite wherein the personal identifier distinguishes channels to brand and channels to leave unbranded. However, it is unclear actually how the identifier itself distinguishes whether to brand channels or not. It would like an entity other than the identifier itself would make a determination to brand or not.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 6-9, 19, 24, and 31, 32, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patton et al. US Patent Application Publication 2003/0016842 (hereinafter Patton), in view of Chang et al. US Patent Application Publication 2003/0110516 (hereinafter Chang), and further in view of Linnartz US Patent No. 6,314,518 (hereinafter Linnartz).

As per claim 1, Patton teaches a method comprising: receiving video content to be protected from redistribution (taught throughout the reference, such as in paragraphs 30, 32, 36 41; Figure 7); adding a personal identifier in a video content (paragraph 31), wherein the personal identifier displays information associated with a user of the video content (paragraph 31). Further, Patton teaches wherein the personal identifier is placed on at least one of a fixed number of frames or a fixed number of scanned analog video content (paragraph 59).

However, at the time of the invention, Patton does not explicitly teach retaining the personal identifier on a hidden border of a frame on a television monitor. However, this is taught by Chang, such as in paragraph 23 and 29. As well known in the art, an image/object that is displayed outside the 'safe' area will not be displayed on a tv such as a cathode ray tube, but would be displayed in a computing device such as a computer or tv's such as hdtvs. Therefore, the personal identifier will be displayed when the video content is transferred to a computing device, because a computer device is capable of showing data outside a safe area of the tv..

However, at the time of the invention, the Patton combination does not explicitly teach wherein the personal identifier distinguishes channels to brand and channels to leave unbranded, branded channels having a level of security for a program. However, selective branding of different content, based on security levels, is taught by Linnartz, such as in col. 3 line 57 to col. 4 line 26.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include embedding information outside the safe area of a tv. One of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to allow embedding important information in signals that do not degrade performance and also prevents data being lost in systems. This is taught in Chang paragraph 7. Further, Chang is relevant art, as it teaches embedding information into the tv signals, such as watermarks and data used for copy protection.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Linnartz with the Patton combination. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to create high quality watermarks when necessary while keeping the system cost low, as taught by Linnartz in col. 2 lines 20-40.

As per claim 6, Patton teaches a method, comprising: receiving video content in a client device (taught throughout the reference, such as in paragraphs 30, 32, 36 41; Figure 7); adding a personal identifier to the video content, wherein the personal identifier signifies personal identity information on an owner of the client device (paragraphs 30, 31), wherein an amount of the personal identifier that is added to the video content is based on a security level of a program (paragraph 59). The other elements are rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 1 above.

As per claim 7, Patton teaches including the personal identifier in the video content when the client device outputs the video content (Figure 6A and 6B).

As per claim 8, Patton teaches wherein the client device outputs the video content by displaying the video content (Figures 6A and 6B).

As per claim 9, Patton teaches wherein the client device is one of a television, a television set-top box, a personal computer, a personal digital assistant, a digital versatile disk player, or a personal video recorder (paragraph 52).

As per independent claim 19, Patton teaches a branding engine for video content, comprising: a brand generator to produce a brand, wherein a brand includes at least one piece of personal identity information about a user of the video content (paragraphs 31, 33); a branding decision engine, wherein if the video content comprises frames, then to decide which frames of the video content are to receive a brand (paragraphs 34, 59); and an overlay generator to place the brand in the video content (paragraphs 33, 38). The other limitations of the claim are rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claims 1 and 6 above.

As per claim 24, Patton teaches further comprising a database of personal identity information about the user communicatively coupled with the branding decision engine (paragraph 58).

Independent claim 31 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 1 above and is clearly taught throughout Patton. Computer readable media containing instructions that are executable by a computer to perform such actions are inherent to the system taught in Patton, as Patton utilizes actions that are performed on a computer.

Claim 32 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 8 above. This is also shown in Patton Figures 6A and 6B.

Claim 34 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claims 7, 8, and 34.

As per claim 35, Patton teaches adding the personal identifier as a video signal to the video content and outputting the video content and the personal identifier (taught throughout Patton, such as in paragraphs 30-36 and Figures 6A and 6B).

12. Claims 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patton, Chang, and Linnartz as applied above, and in view of Yoshida US Patent No. 6,411,712 (hereinafter Yoshida).

As per claim 2, Patton does not explicitly teach wherein the video content includes multiple programs. Multiple programs in a video content is well known in the art. Yoshida teaches the use of multiple programs in a video content throughout the reference, such as in Figure 23 a-e. More information may be found in col. 31 lines 30-43. Further, Chang deals with television broadcast, and it is very well known in the art, if not inherent, that multiple programs may exist in a television broadcast.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include multiple programs in a video content. One of ordinary skill in the art



would have been motivated to perform such an addition to be able to supply multiple programs to a user so that he may have a variety of programs to view. Also, by supplying multiple programs, programs may be free or some may be paid for, as taught in Yoshida col. 1 lines 36-49.

Claim 11 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 2 above.

13. Claims 3, 4, 13, 15, 16, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patton, Chang, Linnartz, and Yoshida as applied above, and further in view of Stone US Patent Application Publication 2002/0080964 (hereinafter Stone).

As per claim 3, Patton teaches throughout the reference the addition of personal identifiers, and Yoshida teaches a way to distinguish between free and subscription video programs. Also, Patton teaches that the system can determine whether or not to embed a personal identifier in paragraph 59: The Patton combination does not explicitly teach the use of metadata. However, metadata, and a distinguishment between free and bought metadata is by Stone throughout the reference, such as in paragraph 120-121.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include metadata. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to be able to include additional information to distinguish between programs, as it would provide clarity.

As per claim 4, Stone teaches in paragraph 120 that the metadata is electronic program guide information.

As per claim 13, Yoshida teaches throughout the reference of free and subscription programs. The free programs would have low levels of security (as they are not encrypted, as taught throughout the reference), and the subscription programs would have high security levels (as they are encrypted). Metadata is taught in Stone as shown in the rejection for claim 3 above, and as seen in paragraph 120, free and bought metadata can be distinguished.

As per claim 15, as best understood by the Examiner, Patton teaches wherein the displayed size of a personal identity information added to a program is based on the security level of the program (paragraph 59, wherein if the value of  $n=0$ , there would be no identifier, and thus, the size would be zero).

As per claim 16, as best understood by the Examiner, Patton teaches wherein the visibility of a location of the personal identity information within a displayed image of the program is proportional to the security level of the program (paragraph 59, wherein if the value of "n" is 0, the visibility of a location would be zero, and if n is greater than 1, the visibility of the location can be seen).

As per claim 20, Stone teaches being able to read metadata about the video content, which would inherently require a metadata reader. Security information of whether to brand the video is taught throughout Patton and Yoshida, such as in Patton 59. Yoshida teaches throughout the reference a system which can decide which

program to encrypt or remain unencrypted (such as with subscription and free programs).

As per claim 21, Yoshida teaches distinguishing between secure and non-secure programs, and Patton teaches a decision whether to brand the video or not, in paragraph 59.

As per claim 22, Patton teaches wherein the security information includes a security level for a program within the video content (paragraph 59), wherein the security level determines characteristics of the brand to be added to the program (paragraph 59). Yoshida also teaches the security levels of the different programs (level of secure/encrypted and free/unencrypted).

Claim 23 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claims 14-16

14. 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patton, Chang, Linnartz, Yoshida, and Stone as applied above, and further in view of Schmelzer US Patent Application Publication 2003/0037010 (hereinafter Schmelzer).

As per claim 17, the Patton combination teaches metadata, but does not explicitly teach wherein the metadata includes a record of the user's history of unauthorized redistribution of a video content. However, a record of the user's history of unauthorized redistribution of a video content is well known in the art, as taught throughout Shmelzer, such as in paragraph 74.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Schmeizer with the Patton combination. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to take into account a user's fraudulent history to be able to ensure that the valued content is safe by determining if further protective actions need to be performed on the valued content.

As per claim 18, Schmelzer teaches taking further action when a related fraudulent history record of a user is detected in paragraph 74. The variance in display factors are rejected as shown in the rejections for claims 14-17 above.

15. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patton, Chang, and Linnartz as applied above, and in view of Simpson et al. US Patent Application Publication 2003/0165253 (hereinafter Simpson).

As per claim 25, Patton and Simpson do not explicitly teach a store of identifiers associated with the database of personal identity information. However, a store of identifiers that are used for embedding is taught in Simpson throughout the reference, such as in paragraphs 16, 31, 32.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include a store of identifiers that are associated with a user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to be able to associate images that are to be embedded easily. Simpson is also directed toward embedding visual watermarks to protect from distribution.

16. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patton, Chang, Linnartz, and Simpson as applied above, and further in view of Schmelzer US Patent Application Publication 2003/0037010 (hereinafter Schmelzer).

As per claim 26, Patton and Simpson teach a database of personal identity information, but does not explicitly teach a record of the user's history of unauthorized redistribution. This is taught though in Schmelzer, such as in paragraph 74.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Schmeizer with the Patton combination. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to take into account a user's fraudulent history to be able to ensure that the valued content is safe by determining if further protective actions need to be performed on the valued content.

As per claim 27, Patton teaches making a branding decision (paragraph 59). Schmelzer teaches that actions can be determined based on the record of the user's history (paragraph 74).

17. Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patton, Chang, Simpson, Linnartz, and Schmelzer as applied above, and further in view of Stone US Patent Application Publication 2002/0080964 (hereinafter Stone).

As per claim 28, Patton teaches making a branding decision (paragraph 59) based on security levels. However, the use of metadata is not taught. Metadata, such as free and bought metadata, is taught throughout Stone, such as in paragraphs 120-121.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include metadata. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to be able to include additional information to distinguish between programs, as it would provide clarity and more security for the programs that need to be secured..

Claim 29 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 23 above.

### ***Conclusion***

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON K. GEE whose telephone number is (571)272-6431. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason Gee  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
04/16/2008

/Kambiz Zand/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2134